REMARKS

STATUS OF APPLICATION

Claims 1-18 will be pending after entry of the amendments set forth herein.

Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Edwards et al. (US 2002/0156795).

RESPONSE TO REJECTION

Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Edwards et al. (US 2002/0156795).

Applicants' attorney respectfully traverses the rejection, and requests that it be reconsidered and withdrawn in light of the following remarks.

Given that the technical subject matter of Edwards, and of the present invention, are somewhat abstract, prior to a detailed discussion Applicants' attorney offers the following analogy, which may help in understanding the difference between them:

The difference between Edwards and the present invention is like the difference between building a road and driving on it.

This analogy may be applied to a distributed communication network, in the sense that building a road is like establishing that network components can communicate with each other. Driving on a road (i.e., transporting cargo or passengers from place to place) is like the actual act of sending data over the network between components.

Edwards teaches a system and method for establishing communication between network components. Different components may use different communication protocols (paragraph [0002], lines 8-10). Predetermined protocols (paragraph [0002], lines 3-4 and 10-11) may be used, and such protocols may be standardized (paragraph [0002], lines 11-14) can be a partial solution for establishing such communication.

Edwards performs additional road-building by providing universal interfaces (FIG. 1; elements 20A, through 24A) associated with components 20-24. For communication with a given component, its universal interface in invoked (paragraph [0022], lines 6-10.

A universal interface may be created in terms of multiple fields. For instance, the universal interface 20A includes seven fields (listed by name in FIG. 1), and the universal interface 21A includes three fields (also listed by name in FIG. 1). It is true that some of these fields include in their names the word "data", such as the fields "Data Source Interface" and "Data Sink Interface" of the universal interface 20A. However, despite their names, they are not data itself, they are merely part of the universal interface. That is, they are part of the road-building, not part of the driving.

By contrast, the present invention presupposes that communication is established (i.e., that the road is built, and open). We're "on the road" (to quote the book title by Jack Kerouac), and we're "delivering a data object" as per independent claims 1 and 5, or "receiving a data object" as per independent claim 10.

The data object itself is characterized as, for instance, a "native data type", such as an integer, a "float" (i.e., a floating point number, or a byte (page 3, line 12 of the specification). These would commonly be the sort of data types that might be sent over a network. However, there is no teaching or suggestion in Edwards that the fields of the universal interfaces contain such data. Therefore, a person of ordinary skill, reading Edwards, would not understand the universal interfaces, or their fields, to teach or suggest the claimed "data object" (claims 1, 5, and 10), or the "data type representations" (the same claims, and also recited elsewhere), or the "native data type representation" (claims 2-3 and 7-9).

The data object may, alternatively, be characterized as a "container data type representation", such as an array (page 3, lines 12-13 of the specification). Likewise, a person of ordinary skill, reading Edwards, would not understand the universal interfaces, or their fields, to teach or suggest the claimed "container data type representation" (claims 2-4 and 7-9).

Additional cited portions of Edwards also fail to teach or suggest the claimed invention. For instance, paragraphs [0027] and [0028] of Edwards are cited as alleged teachings of the recited "container" and "native data type representation[s]" of claims 2 and 7. However, these paragraphs again discuss aspects of the universal interfaces of FIG. 1, which as discussed above are not teachings or suggestions of the recited "data". For instance, paragraph [0027] describes program instructions (lines 7-10) in various programming languages (lines 10-15). Regardless of whether memory could contain data as well as such program instructions, there is no teaching or suggestion that they in fact do so. Therefore, it will be seen once again that the Edwards teaching is limited to interfaces and program code for executing tasks pertaining to such interface (i.e., "road-building"), and not to "data" as recited in Applicants' claims.

Additional aspects or Edwards' teaching are cited in support of other ones of Applicants' claims. However, it is submitted that analysis of such passages will also show that the cited passages pertain to aspects of the universal interfaces of the communication network described therein, and also do not pertain to the respective ones of Applicants' claims, against which they are cited. Applicants' attorney thanks the Examiner for the detailed breakdown of the basis for claim rejections, but believes that the distinction between Edwards and the claimed inv3ention is made clear from the discussion above.

In summary, it is submitted that Edwards, as properly understood by a person of ordinary skill in the art, would not have taught or suggested the claimed invention. It is respectfully requested that the rejections be reconsidered and withdrawn.

CONCLUSION AND PRAYER FOR RELIEF

In light of the foregoing, it is submitted that the remaining claims are in condition for allowance. It is respectfully requested that the claims be allowed.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney by telephone, between 8:30 and 5:00 Pacific time, if it is believed that such a telephone interview will expedite prosecution of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

/James C. Pintner/

James C. Pintner
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 33,272

408-553-3752

August 20, 2008

Agilent Technologies, Inc.
Legal Department, DL429
IP Administration
P.O. Box 7599
Loveland, CO 80537-0599